



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| APPLICATION NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|

10/070501

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

05/23/06

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Bruce E. Lilling (3) Doron Spitz
(2) Sean L. Felleher (4) Vladimir Klatzkin
Date of Interview 5/23/06 (5) Raymond Alejandro

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☒ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: prototype of batteries & presentation on relationship of energy/volume/weight/Price

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending claims

Identification of prior art discussed: all cited references

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant wanted to discuss what appears to be the difference between the prior art & the present claims, particularly: the specific pressure applying means (the casing/container per se), the specific flexible separator (i.e. the 3 layer separator made of cellophane/nylon/polypropylene), the specific compressed particles. In this respect applicant further explained that their invention includes using the case as a spring to improve capacity. Applicant also discussed the specific battery system (i.e. Ag/Zn).
(A full description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

*In this regard, the examiner pointed out that most of the foregoing features are not currently recited in the claims. Thus, applicant's arguments were not commensurate in scope therewith. It was advised that applicant further elaborate the claim language to add materially ~~diff~~/structurally different features.
2/2/05/23/06